



Indiana Pro Bono Commission  
One Indiana Square, Suite 530  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation  
230 East Ohio Street, Suite 200  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

## COMBINED 2004 DISTRICT REPORT, 2006 PRO BONO GRANT APPLICATION, AND 2006 PLAN

Pro Bono District: 6

Applicant: District Six Access to Justice, Inc.

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 324

City: New Castle, IN Zip: 47362

Phone: 1-800-910-4407 Fax: 765-529-9213

E-mail address: [district6access@hotmail.com](mailto:district6access@hotmail.com) Website address: [www.in.gov/judiciary/probono](http://www.in.gov/judiciary/probono)

Judicial Appointee: Honorable Mary G. Willis, Henry County Circuit Court

Plan Administrator: Marianne Legge, J.D.

Names of Counties served: Henry, Delaware, Madison, Grant, Jay, Randolph, Blackford

Percentage of volunteer attorneys (as defined on page 6) *who accepted a pro bono case in 2004*  
per registered attorneys in district, i.e. the district's pro bono participation rate 26%  
To the extent the pro bono participation rate information is available by county, please  
provide below.

**Henry County 38 Attys**

20 volunteer attys  
15 Cases accepted in 2004  
39% Participation Rate

**Delaware Co. 136 Attys**

35 Volunteer Attys  
97 cases accepted in 2004  
70% Participation Rate

**Madison Co. 158 Attys**

34 volunteer attys  
3 cases accepted in 2004  
1.8% participation rate

**Grant Co. 77 Attys**

no program in 2004  
2 cases accepted in 2004  
2.5% participation rate

Amount of grant received for 2005: \$10,000

Amount of grant (2004 & prior years) projected to be unused as of 12/31/05: \$0

Amount requested for 2006: \$35,000

<b>PRO BONO DISTRICT NUMBER 6 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION</b>
--

**The following representations**, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

**Operation under Rule 6.6**

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to **Rule 6.6** of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within the district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to **Rule 6.6** (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to **Rule 6.6** (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results; and
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission.

## **Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence**

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

**1. Participation by the local bar associations and attorneys.** The associations and attorneys believe the program is necessary and beneficial.

**2. Centrality of client needs.** The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available.

**3. Program priorities.** The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal providers and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.

**4. Direct representation component.** The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.

**5. Coordination with state and local civil legal providers and bar associations.** The programs work cooperatively with the local civil legal providers. The partnerships between the civil legal providers and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.

**6. Accountability.** The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.

**7. Continuity.** The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff.

**8. Cost-effectiveness.** The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.

**9. Minimization of barriers.** The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.

**10. Understanding of ethical considerations.** The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.

**11. ABA Standards.** The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request.

We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

**Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:**

**It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.**

**Signatures:**

**Mary G. Willis, Henry County Circuit Court**  
**Judicial Appointee Signature**

**6/29/05**  
**Date**

**Marianne Legge, J.D.**  
**Plan Administrator Signature**

**6/29/05**  
**Date**

## 2006 PLAN SUMMARY

1. Please write a brief summary of the 2006 grant request. Please include information regarding your district's planned activities including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion. The grant request should cover needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, anticipated outcomes, and how past difficulties will be addressed.

### Goals & Desired Outcomes:

#### **To Continue to have Coordinating pro bono programs between Henry, Madison, Delaware, and Grant Counties.**

- Currently there are four functioning programs in District 6. The listed counties have working programs, the data is collected in a consistent manner in the counties and there are similar procedures to administer programs. The programs have or will have intake times by phone or in person at least twice a month. This will provide a consistency in delivery of services between the Counties.
- One Program is currently using paralegal/pre-law students to handle intakes. By 2006 it is hoped that three of the four running programs will be conducting intake in this manner or a manner similar to this. We want to provide the interns/students with hands-on experience and, in some cases, class credit. Indiana Wesleyan University is allowing students to participate for credit. We anticipate Ball State and Anderson University to follow suit once we have a set structure in those counties.

#### **To provide all counties in District 6 with adequate access to Pro Se forms and legal information.**

- Most, if not all, public libraries in the District are equipped with Internet Access. This provides access to the Pro Se forms. Some Libraries have Pro Se forms printed out for the patrons. District Six will continue to work with local bar associations and pro bono committees so that we can continue to provide innovative ways to assist the pro se population.
- Some Courthouses, Henry County, have pro se forms available at the Court offices. Delaware County is working to have Pro Se forms available at the Clerk's Office. Grant County has the forms in the Local library and Madison County has pro se forms located in the Court Administrator's office.

### Planned Activities for 2006:

- To have "Talk to a Lawyer today" and corresponding CLE in each County in the District.
- Continued collaboration with existing service providers, such as Indiana Legal Services, to avoid duplication of services. District is split between the Fort Wayne and Indianapolis office.
- Informing media of Pro Bono/Pro Se Activities to allow for continued involvement with the Community.
- Working on innovative ways to recognize attorney's efforts on a Local, District and Statewide level.
- Consistent bi-monthly board meetings to keep board members informed of activities and to share progress.
- Plan Administrator will make efforts to work with counties Bar Associations and Pro Bono committee's to continue to provide service.

### Past Difficulties

- Getting access to the smaller counties, Randolph, Jay and Blackford to have representation on our board, and to have services provided.
- Some of the Counties had elections in 2004, which proved to be difficult in meeting with pro bono committee's
- Since May 2004 there has been one Plan Administrator, prior to this, there were gaps in Administrators.

## **2004 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY CASES IN DISTRICT 6**

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 6A.

Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each pro bono case for that attorney.

Definitions:

Case: A legal matter referred to and accepted by a pro bono attorney volunteer. This includes mediation and GAL services.

Volunteer Attorney: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program. This does not include attorneys who are on the list of pro bono volunteers but who have never taken a case. The case numbers do not include cases screened, only cases actually referred to a pro bono attorney.

Case Type: Please use the abbreviations listed in Indiana Supreme Court Administrative Rule 8(B)(3) or any other defined abbreviation.

**Name of Pro Bono Provider** (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): **District Six Access to Justice, Inc.**

**IOLTA funding accounts for 100 % of total pro bono provider budget. Please state the percentage of volunteers and cases which are attributable to IOLTA funding 100%. If this percentage is substantially more than the percentage of IOLTA funding, please explain.**

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
E.Ed Dunsmore	Henry	2003	2004	21.7	DR
David Jordan	Henry	2003	2004	3	DR
Natalie Synder	Henry	2003	2004	3.8	DR
Mary Wisheart-Phillips	Henry	2003	2004	14.6	DR
R. Scott Hayes	Henry	2004	2004	4.5	DR
Nancy Brown	Henry	2004	Open		ADMIN
David Copenhagen	Henry	2004	Open		Contract
David Sadler	Henry	2004	2004	6	DR
David Scott	Henry	2004	2004	3	DR
R.Scott Hayes	Henry	2003	2004	3.5	DR
Michael Mahoney	Henry	2003	2004	10	DR
David Scott	Henry	2004	2004	1.85	Custody
R.Scott Hayes/Natalie Synder	Henry	2004	2004	9.5	DR
Rob Roberts	Henry	2004	Open		CP
David McCord	Henry	2004	Open		Credit
David Jordan	Henry	2004	Open		DR
R.Scott Hayes	Henry	2004	Open		CP
David Sadler	Henry	2004	Open		DR

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Year Case Accepted	Year Case Closed	Number of Hours	Case Type
-------------------------	--------	--------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------

Dianna Bennington	Delaware	2004	2004	15	DR
Kim Dowling	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Kelly Bryan	Delaware	2004	Open	2.9 to date	Custody
B. Joseph Davis	Delaware	2004	Open		MF
Bruce Munson	Delaware	2004	Open		Dr. Lic.
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	2004	Open		JP
Rebecca Bruce	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Michael Painter	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
John Brooke	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Brian Pierce	Delaware	2004	2004	5	DR
Dylan Vigh	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
James Schafer	Delaware	2004	Open		Dr.Lic.
Kenneth Schuck	Delaware	2004	Open		Soc Sec
William Bruns	Delaware	2004	Open		CP
Ross Rowland	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Leslie Horn	Delaware	2004	2005	35	JP
Casey Cloyd	Delaware	2004	Open		Dr. Lic
Alan Wilson	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
James Schafer	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Thomas Raisor	Delaware	2004	Open		Visitation
Chris Alexander	Delaware	2004	2004	2	GU
Steven Murphy	Delaware	2004	2005	5	Custody
Brian Pierce	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Jennie Scott	Delaware	2004	2004	1	Visitation
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Dianna Bennington	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Linda Clark Dague	Delaware	2004	2004	3.1	JP
David Brock	Delaware	2004	2004	6.9	CC
Michael Painter	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Kelly Bryan	Delaware	2004	Open	1.2	Support
John Brooke	Delaware	2004	Open		Visitation
Charles Clark	Delaware	2004	Open		Visitation
Dylan Vigh	Delaware	2004	Open		Support
Ross Rowland	Delaware	2004	2005	43	DR
Alan Wilson	Delaware	2004	Open		Support
Greg Huffman	Delaware	2004	Open		GU
Brian Pierce	Delaware	2004	2004	70	Custody
Leslie Horn	Delaware	2004	2005	25	Custody
Sara Shade	Delaware	2004	2004	11	GU
Malcom Metzler	Delaware	2004	2004	1.5	CP
Steven Murphy	Delaware	2004	2004	4	DR
Charles Rutherford	Delaware	2004	Open		CP
Bruce Munson	Delaware	2004	Open		CP
Brian Pierce	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Jennie Scott	Delaware	2004	2004	5	Custody
Dianna Bennington	Delaware	2004	2004	9.5	DR
Casey Cloyd	Delaware	2004	2004	5.9	CC

Rebecca Bruce	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Chip Alexander	Delaware	2004	2004	4	GU
William Bruns	Delaware	2004	Open		Dr.Lic.
Kimberly Dowling	Delaware	2004	2004	1	Custody
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Charles Clark	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Richard Hughes	Delaware	2004	2004	.5	CP
John Brooke	Delaware	2004	2004	6	JP
Linda Clark Dague	Delaware	2004	2004	4.2	DR
Michael Painter	Delaware	2004	Open		Support
B.Joseph Davis	Delaware	2004	Open		CP
Jennie Scott	Delaware	2004	2004	4	CC
Leslie Horn	Delaware	2004	2005	20	Custody
Steven Murphy	Delaware	2004	2004	.5	Custody
Chip Alexander	Delaware	2004	Open		GU
William Bates	Delaware	2004	Open		GU
Dylan Vigh	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
David Brock	Delaware	2004	2004	14.5	Consumer
Jack Buckles	Delaware	2004	2004	2	Will
Casey Cloyd	Delaware	2004	2004	8	CP
Ross Rowland	Delaware	2004	Open		Support
Brian Pierce	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Douglas Mawhorr	Delaware	2004	Open		Consumer
James Schafer	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Holly Wanzer	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
William Lutz	Delaware	2004	2004	.74	Medicaid
Rebecca Bruce	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Bruce Munson	Delaware	2004	Open		Consumer
Michael Painter	Delaware	2004	Open		Custody
Dianna Bennington	Delaware	2004	2005	6	CC
B.Joseph Davis	Delaware	2004	Open		Consumer
Steven Murphy	Delaware	2004	2004	.5	DR
Sara Shade	Delaware	2004	Open		EU
Holly Wanzer	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Bruce Munson	Delaware	2004	Open		Consumer
Richard Hughes	Delaware	2004	2005	2	Tax
Richard Hughes	Delaware	2004	2004	2	CC
John Brooke	Delaware	2004	Open		Visitation
David Brock	Delaware	2004	2004	3	CC
Charles Clark	Delaware	2004	Open		Support
Tara Smalstig	Delaware	2004	Open		Soc. Sec.
Casey Cloyd	Delaware	2004	Open		CP
Michael Painter	Delaware	2004	Open		Visitation
Kenneth Schuck	Delaware	2004	Open		Soc. Sec
B. Joseph Davis	Delaware	2004	Open		CC
Linda Clark Dague	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Charles Rutherford	Delaware	2004	2004	2.5	Will
Holly Wanzer	Delaware	2004	Open		DR
Richard Hughes	Delaware	2004	2004	1.5	Will

<b>Chip Alexander</b>	<b>Delaware</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Open</b>		<b>GU</b>
<b>Mark Spitzer</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Open</b>		<b>GU</b>
<b>Happi Johnston</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Open</b>		<b>DR</b>
<b>Mark Bennett</b>	<b>Madison</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Open</b>		<b>GU</b>
<b>Lisa Delay</b>	<b>Madison</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>Visitation</b>
<b>Tim Lanane</b>	<b>Madison</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Open</b>		<b>Emancipation</b>
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>TOTAL:</b>	
Overall total number of volunteer attorneys:	<b>120</b>	Overall total number of cases accepted or pend- ing:	<b>72 cases Pending</b>	Overall total hours on closed cases:	<b>414.79 4.1 Pending</b>

## 2004 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY LIMITED INFORMATION ACTIVITY IN DISTRICT 6

This limited legal information chart can include activities such as pro se clinics and call-in or walk-in informational services.

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 7A.

Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each type of legal information activity for that attorney.

**Name of Pro Bono Provider** (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): **District Six Access to Justice, Inc.**

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Type of Activity	Number of Hours
Dana Kenworthy	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	4
Brian McLane	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	4
Happi Johnston	Grant	Talk to a Lawyer Today	4
Leslie Horn	Delaware	Talk to a Lawyer Today	4.5
Robert Wisehart	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Jim Millikan	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	1
David Copenhaver	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	1
Bill Baker	Henry	Talk to a Lawyer Today	1
Richard Bash	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Gerald Shine	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
D. Eric Hall	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Ardeth Wilson	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Rodney Cummings	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Timothy Lanane	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
John W. LongnakerIII	Madison	Talk to a Lawyer Today	2
Richard Hughes	Delaware	Average Intake 2 hours a week for 52 weeks	104
<b>TOTAL:</b>			<b>TOTAL:</b>
<b>OVERALL VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY TOTAL:</b>	<b>15</b>		<b>OVERALL HOURS TOTAL: 142.5</b>

## 2004 REPORT

**Please list your District's 2004 activities--including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion--in chronological order.**

<u><b>Date</b></u>	<u><b>Activity</b></u>
January 2004	Talk to a Lawyer Today Henry County-Newspaper Ad Delaware-Newspaper Ad Grant- Press Release Madison- Announcement in the paper
2/3/04	Board Meeting
April 2004	Plan Administrator attended ABA conference in Atlanta
4/20/04	Board Meeting
5/11/04	Board Meeting
6/3/04	Meeting with Delaware County Pro Bono Board
6/15/04	Board Meeting
6/17/05	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
7/6/04	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
7/12/04	Meeting with Madison County Pro Bono Board
7/12/04	Meeting with Delaware County Pro Bono Board
7/27/04	Meeting with Madison County Pro Bono Board
8/2/04	Meeting with Madison County Pro Bono Board
8/3/04	Board Meeting
8/4/05	Plan Administrator's and Law School Rep's met via conference call to discuss mentoring program.
8/12/04	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
8/17/04	Plan Administrator, Judicial Appointee, and Norman Metzger, ILS met to discuss concerns with the Madison County ILS office.
8/30/04	Madison County Pro Bono Board meeting
9/7/04	Board Meeting
9/9/04	Meeting with Grant County Pro Bono Board
10/13/04	Meeting with Ball State Paralegal Student Association and Ivy Tech Paralegal program.
10/15/04	Plan Administrator's meeting and Shepard Dinner
11/16/04	Board Meeting
11/22/04	Meeting with Madison County United Way.
12/10/04	Access to Justice Conference-Indianapolis (sponsored by ILS)

## 2004 REPORT

**Please provide a short summary of how the provision of pro bono service is coordinated in your district, including the intake process, the relationships of pro bono providers in the district, how referrals are made, and how reporting is done.**

**Henry County:** Intakes are conducted twice a month for one hour at the Justice Center. If a referral is made, the attorney and the client are sent correspondence. The client is to make contact and set up the appointment. Upon completion of representation, the attorney will send the plan administrator a case closing report indicating the time they spent on the case. The plan administrator will record the time on the state website.

**Madison County:** Intakes are handled currently by phone on Thursdays from 9a.m. to 11a.m. taken by the plan administrator. There are calls Monday thru Friday. If a referral is made, then the attorney and client are given notification. It is the client's responsibility to set the appointment. Upon completion of the representation, the plan administrator is sent a case closing report. The plan administrator will record the time on the state website. In 2005 Madison County is looking to work with United Way to have a "set" intake with a person.

**Delaware County:** The intakes are handled by Richard Hughes at Defur Voran. The Muncie program is in the process of getting reorganized so that there is a set intake by a person. Referrals are to be made or rejected by the Plan Administrator. Currently Mr. Hughes will make the referral to the Attorney and notify the client.

**Grant County:** In 2004 there was organization of the program. Connections were made with Indiana Wesleyan University to set up a practicum with the students in the Pre-Law program. The Program did not commence until March 2005. There was also work to set up a Pro Bono Mediation Program with the Courts. The intakes and mediations will take place in the Jury Rooms of the Courthouse in Marion, IN. The program will provide two opportunities for live intakes, and the referrals will be made as in other counties. The Mediations will be Court Ordered.

**Please describe any special circumstances, including difficulties encountered, affecting your District's 2004 implementation of its plan.**

The previous plan administrator left in April 2004, the current administrator started in May 2004. There was some time involved with getting acclimated to the program and meeting with representatives of the counties that had, or want programs.

The elections that occurred in the Fall 2004 were somewhat of an impediment in some of the Counties due to some board members are elected officials.

### BUDGETS FOR 2004, 2005 AND 2006 FOR IOLTA FUNDS ONLY

			2005		
--	--	--	------	--	--

Cost Category	2004 Actual Expenditures	2004 Budget	Actual Expenditures To Date	2005 Budget	2006 Budget
<b>A. PERSONNEL COSTS</b>					
1. Plan Administrator	17,782.75	22,000	7,626.37	22,000	22,500
2. Paralegals					
3. Others- <b>Please explain</b>	5132.37		1894.83		
4. Employee benefits		3,000		3,000	3,000
a. Insurance	1072.00		1113.00		
b. Retirement plans					
c. Other- <b>Please explain</b>					
5. Total Personnel Costs	23,987.12	25,000	10634.20	25,000	25,000
<b>B. NON-PERSONNEL COSTS</b>					
1. Occupancy	In-Kind		In-Kind	In-Kind	In-Kind
2. Equipment rental	In-Kind		In-Kind	In-Kind	In-Kind
3. Office supplies	76.43	150.00	80.34	150.00	300.00
4. Telephone	\$747.40	360.00	208.32	360.00	1000.00
5. Travel	609.53	1,100	562.54	1,100	2000.00
6. Training	20.00	1500		1500	1500
7. Library					
8. Malpractice Insurance					
9. Dues and fees	\$68.00	250.00		250.00	250.00
10. Audit					
11. Contingent reserve		2,000		2,000	2,300
12. Litigation reserve					
13. Marketing and promotion		1,000	145.00	1,000	1,000
14. Attorney recognition					\$500.00
15. Litigation Expenses (includes expert fees)					
16. Property Acquisition					
17. Contract Services	489.53		262.00		500.00
18. Grants to other pro bono providers					
19. Other- <b>Please explain</b>	124.74 – printing \$26.65 Postage \$32.97-misc				
20. Total Non-Personnel Costs	1922.22	6360			
<b>C. TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	25,572.81	31,360	11970.93	31,510	35,000

IOLTA funds received **2004: \$1,000** IOLTA funds received **2005: \$10,000**

## **Budget Narrative**

Please provide descriptions of the following line items in the foregoing budget chart, by item number, in the space provided.

Lines (A)(1), (2), (3) Please indicate the number of hours per week for each personnel position and rate of pay.

The Plan Administrator is employed on a part-time basis, 15 hours weekly. She earns an annual salary of 17,500. She is currently the only paid position with District 6. Benefits included Workers Compensation and auto coverage while working.

Line (B)(1) Please describe the occupancy cost in terms of square footage, utilities or other amenities and indicate whether the occupancy cost is above or below the market rate for that space.

Office Space, Computer, Utilities used is in-kind from Henry County. The Plan Administrator is also the Family Court Administrator and uses the same space. The only utility cost is the phone and the usage of the phone.

<b>ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS:</b>
---

January 1:	Checks distributed
July 1:	Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC
November:	Notification of awards
<b>December 1:</b>	<b>IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due</b>